Sharp Sufficient Conditions for Stable Recovery of Block Sparse Signals by Block Orthogonal Matching Pursuit

Jinming Wen, Zhengchun Zhou, Zilong Liu, Ming-Jun Lai, and Xiaohu Tang

arXiv:1605.02894v1 [cs.IT] 10 May 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we use the block orthogonal matching pursuit (BOMP) algorithm to recover block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ from measurements $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{v}$, where $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a ℓ_2 bounded noise vector (i.e., $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for some constant ϵ). We investigate some sufficient conditions based on the block restricted isometry property (block-RIP) for exact (when $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{0}$) and stable (when $\boldsymbol{v} \neq \boldsymbol{0}$) recovery of block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$. First, on the one hand, we show that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with constant $\delta_{K+1} < 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, then every K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be exactly or stably recovered by BOMP in K iterations; On the other hand, for any $K \geq 1$ and $1/\sqrt{K+1} \leq t < 1$, there exists a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$ and a K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ such that the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations. Second, we study some sufficient conditions for recovering α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signals. Surprisingly, it is shown that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$, every α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal can be exactly or stably recovered by the BOMP algorithm in K iterations, under some conditions on α. Our newly found sufficient condition on the block-RIP of $\boldsymbol{A}$ is weaker than that for ℓ_1 minimization for this special class of sparse signals, which further convinces the effectiveness of BOMP. Furthermore, for any $K \geq 1$, $\alpha > 1$ and $\sqrt{2}/2 \leq t < 1$, the recovery of $\boldsymbol{x}$ may fail in K iterations for a sensing matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ which satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$. Finally, we study some sufficient conditions for partial recovery of block sparse signals. Specifically, if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$, then BOMP is guaranteed to recover some blocks of $\boldsymbol{x}$ if these blocks satisfy a sufficient condition. We further show that the condition on the blocks of $\boldsymbol{x}$ is sharp.

Index Terms

Compressed sensing, block restricted isometry property, block orthogonal matching pursuit (BOMP), block sparse signals, α-strongly-decaying.

I. Introduction

In many applications, such as computer vision, image reconstruction and blind sources separation (see, e.g., [1]–[6]), we need to recover a K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e., this signal has at most K nonzero entries) from the following linear model

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{v}, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an observation signal, $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ($m \ll n$) is a known sensing matrix, and $\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a noise vector, e.g., Gaussian noise vector (i.e., $v \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \boldsymbol{I})$ as explained in [7]).

J. Wen is with ENS de Lyon, Laboratoire LIP (U. Lyon, CNRS, ENSL, INRIA, UCBL), Lyon, France, 69007, (e-mail: jwen@math.mcgill.ca).

Z. Zhou is with the School of Mathematics, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu 610031, China, (e-mail: zzc@home.swjtu.edu.cn).

Z. Liu is with School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore, 639798. (e-mail: ZilongLIU@ntu.edu.sg).

M. Lai is with Department of Mathematics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, U.S.A., (e-mail: mjlai@uga.edu).

X. Tang is with the Information Security and National Computing Grid Laboratory, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu 610031, China, (e-mail: xhutang@swjtu.edu.cn).

This work was supported by “Programme Avenir Lyon Saint-Etienne de l’Université de Lyon” in the framework of the programme “Inverstissements d’Avenir” (ANR-11-IDEX-0007) and ANR through the HPAC project under Grant ANR 11 BS02 013.

Manuscript received; revised .

A natural method of recovering $\boldsymbol{x}$ in (1) is to solve the following ℓ_0-minimization problem which is however NP-hard [8].

$$\min \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 : \quad \text{subject to } \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{2}$$

Instead, one can efficiently solve the following ℓ_1-minimization problem under some conditions on $\boldsymbol{A}$ as demonstrated in the pioneering work [9] and [1].

$$\min \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 : \quad \text{subject to } \|\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{3}$$

In addition to the Gaussian noise [7], the ℓ_2 bounded noise (i.e., $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for some constant ϵ) case has been studied in [10]–[13]. The research on ℓ_∞ bounded noise (i.e., $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$ for some constant ϵ) case can be found in [14]). In this paper, we focus only on the ℓ_2 bounded noise vector as our results can be easily extended to the other two types.

To analyze the recovery of sparse signals, a commonly used concept is the so-called restricted isometry property (RIP) (cf. [1]). For a sensing matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and for any integer $1 \leq K \leq n$, the K-restricted isometry constant (RIC) $\delta_K \in [0, 1)$ of A is the smallest constant such that

$$(1 - \delta_K)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_K)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \tag{4}$$

for all K-sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$. Another commonly used concept is the mutual coherence (cf. [15]) which is defined as

$$\mu = \max_{i\neq j} \frac{|\boldsymbol{A}_i^T \boldsymbol{A}_j|}{\|\boldsymbol{A}_i\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{A}_j\|_2}, \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{A}_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) is the i-th column of $\boldsymbol{A}$.

There have been a variety of sufficient conditions for exactly (when $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 = 0$) or stably recovering $\boldsymbol{x}$ by solving (3). For example, $\delta_{2K} < \sqrt{2} - 1$ in [12], $\delta_{2K} < 0.4531$ in [16], $\delta_{2K} < 0.4652$ in [17] and $\delta_{2K} < \sqrt{2}/2$ in [18]. Moreover, it was shown in [18] and [19] that the exact recovery of $\boldsymbol{x}$ may not be possible if $\delta_{2K} \geq \sqrt{2}/2$.

In addition to the ℓ_1 minimization approach in (3), the orthogonal matching pursuit (OMP) [20] is another widely-used algorithm to solve (2) due to its efficiency in computation. There are also many sufficient conditions for exactly or stably recovering $\boldsymbol{x}$ by using the OMP algorithm, see, e.g., [21]–[25]. Recently, it was shown in [26] that if $\delta_{K+1} < 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, the exact recovery of the K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be guaranteed by using the OMP algorithm in K iterations. Some necessary conditions on the recovery capability of the OMP algorithm can be found in [23], [24]. In particular, it was shown in [27] that if $\delta_{K+1} \geq 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, the OMP algorithm may fail to recover a K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations.

Generally speaking, solving (2) by the OMP algorithm is faster than solving (3) by the interior point method or simplex method or their variants. However, the corresponding sharp sufficient condition for (2) is $\delta_{K+1} < 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, which is much stronger than the condition $\delta_{2K} < \sqrt{2}/2$ for (3). Thus, we ask if there exists a class of K-sparse signals which can be exactly or stably recovered by the OMP algorithm in K iterations when $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$. Our study shows that the answer to this question is positive. Details of our answer are given in Theorems 5 and 6 in Section III.C of this paper.

Signals with decaying property arise in many applications, see e.g., [28], [29]. Specifically, without loss of generality, we assume all the non-zero entries of a K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ are ordered by magnitude, i.e.,

$$|x_1| \geq |x_2| \geq \ldots \geq |x_K| \geq 0,$$

and $|x_j| = 0$ for $K + 1 \leq j \leq n$. Then, a K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ is called an α-strongly-decaying signal [21] ($\alpha > 1$) if

$$|x_i| \geq \alpha|x_{i+1}|, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K - 1.$$

There are a few works concerning sufficient conditions for recovering this class of sparse signals. It was shown in [21] that under some conditions on α, $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{3}$ is a sufficient condition for recovering

α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signals (that are noise-free) by using the OMP algorithm in K iterations. This condition was extended to noise-corrupted models in [30]. Recently, Herzet *et al.* showed in [31] that under other sufficient conditions on α, the mutual coherence μ in (5) with $\mu < \frac{1}{k}$ is a sharp condition. Thus, two natural questions are raised: (1) what is the RIC based necessary and sufficient condition of exactly or stably recovery of α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signals by using the OMP algorithm in K iterations under some conditions on α? (2) what is the sharp condition on α? We shall answer these two questions by Theorems 5-8 in Section III.C of this paper..

This paper focuses on a generalized version of OMP, the Block OMP (BOMP) algorithm, which was independently proposed in [32] and [33]. In many applications, such as recovering signals lying in the unions of subspaces [34]–[37], reconstructing multi-band signals [38], [39], face recognition [40], multiple measurement signals [41]–[44] and clustering of data multiple subspaces [45], the nonzero elements of sparse signals may appear in a few blocks, i.e., the signals are block-sparse. To define block-sparsity, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is viewed as a concatenation of blocks. Similar to [32], we assume $\boldsymbol{x}$ consists of L blocks each having identical length of d (i.e., $n = Ld$). Then, $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{x} = [\boldsymbol{x}^\top[1], \boldsymbol{x}^\top[2], \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^\top[L]]^\top,$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{x}[i] = [x_{d(i-1)+1}, x_{d(i-1)+2}, \ldots, x_{di}]^\top, \quad 1 \le i \le L.$$

A signal $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called K-block sparse if at most K blocks $x[i], i = 1, \cdots, K$, are not zero vectors [32]. Mathematically, a signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ is K-block sparse if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{L} I(\|\boldsymbol{x}[i]\|_2 > 0) \le K,$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function (i.e., it takes the value of 0 when its argument is zero and 1 otherwise). When the block size $d = 1$, block-sparsity reduces to the conventional sparsity as defined in [2], [46]. In the rest of the paper, the conventional sparsity will be called sparsity, in contrast to block-sparsity. Similarly, a sensing matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ can also be represented as a concatenation of column blocks, i.e.,

$$\boldsymbol{A} = [\boldsymbol{A}[1], \boldsymbol{A}[2], \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}[L]],$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{A}[i] = [\boldsymbol{A}_{d(i-1)+1}, \boldsymbol{A}_{d(i-1)+2}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{A}_{di}], \quad 1 \le i \le L.$$

It was shown in [32] that the BOMP algorithm has better reconstruction properties than the standard OMP algorithm. For any ordered set $S \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, L\}$ with ascending entries, let $\boldsymbol{A}[S]$ denote the submatrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$ that contains only the blocks indexed by S and $\boldsymbol{x}[S]$ denote the subvector of $\boldsymbol{x}$ that contains only the blocks indexed by S. For instance, if $S = \{1, 3, 4\}$, we have $\boldsymbol{A}[S] = [\boldsymbol{A}[1], \boldsymbol{A}[3], \boldsymbol{A}[4]]$ and $\boldsymbol{x}[S] = [\boldsymbol{x}^\top[1], \boldsymbol{x}^\top[3], \boldsymbol{x}^\top[4]]^\top$. Then, the BOMP algorithm is formally described below in Algorithm 1.

To analyze the performance of algorithms for block sparse signals, the classic RIP was extended to the block-RIP in [35]. Specifically, we say $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with parameter $\delta_{BK} \in [0, 1)$ if

$$(1 - \delta_{BK})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \le \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \le (1 + \delta_{BK})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \tag{6}$$

for all K block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$, where the smallest constant δ_{BK} is the block-RIC of $\boldsymbol{A}$. Whenever the context is clear, we simply denote it by δ_K in the rest of this paper.

Similarly, without lose of generality, we assume the block entries of $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are ordered by

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[1]\|_2 \ge \|\boldsymbol{x}[2]\|_2 \ge \ldots \ge \|\boldsymbol{x}[K]\|_2 \ge 0, \tag{7}$$

with $\|\boldsymbol{x}[j]\|_2 = 0$ for $K < j \le L$. In the following, we define the block strongly-decaying sparse signal, an extension of the strongly-decaying sparse signals explained above.

Algorithm 1 The BOMP algorithm ([32], [33])

Input: measurements $\boldsymbol{y}$, sensing matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ and sparsity K.
Initialize: $k=0, \boldsymbol{r}^0=\boldsymbol{y}, S_0=\emptyset$.
Iterate the five steps below until the stopping criterion is met.

1: $k=k+1$,
2: $s^k=\arg\max\limits_{1\le i\le L}\|\boldsymbol{A}[i]^T\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}\|_2$,
3: $S_k=S_{k-1}\bigcup\{s^k\}$,
4: $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}[S_k]=\arg\min\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{A}[S_k]\boldsymbol{x}\|_2$,
5: $\boldsymbol{r}^k=\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{A}[S_k]\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}[S_k]$.

Output: $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}=\arg\min\limits_{\boldsymbol{x}:\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{x})\subset S_K}\|\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2$.

Definition 1: Let $\alpha>1$, then a K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathbb{R}^n$ is called a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal if

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[j]\|_2\ge\alpha\|\boldsymbol{x}[j+1]\|_2,\quad 1\le j\le K-1. \tag{8}$$

The main findings of this paper are summarized as follows.

- If $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}<1/\sqrt{K+1}$, then every K-block sparse signal can be exactly or stably recovered by the BOMP algorithm in K iterations, see Theorems 2 and 3. Moreover, for any $K\ge1$ and $1/\sqrt{K+1}\le t<1$, we show that there exists a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}=t$ and a K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ such that the BOMP may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations, see Theorem 4. These extend the existing results in [26] and [27] from $d=1$ to any $d\ge1$ in a non-trivial way. This contribution were in a conference paper [47].
- If $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}<\sqrt{2}/2$, then under some sufficient conditions on α, every α-strongly-decaying K block sparse signal can be exactly or stably recovered by the BOMP Algorithm in K iterations, see Theorems 5 and 6. In addition, for any $K\ge1$, $\alpha>1$ and $\sqrt{2}/2\le t<1$, we show that there exists a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}=t$ and a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ such that the BOMP Algorithm may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations, see Theorem 7. Furthermore, the condition on α is shown to be tight, see Theorem 8. These strengthen the results in [21] from $\delta_{K+1}<1/3$ to $\delta_{K+1}\le\sqrt{2}/2$, and further show the effectiveness of the recovery capability of BOMP.
- Furthermore, we study partial recovery of K-block sparse signals. We show that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}<\sqrt{2}/2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{x}[j]\|_2/\|\boldsymbol{x}[j+1]\|_2, 1\le j\le i$ satisfy a sufficient condition for some $1\le i\le K$, then the BOMP algorithm chooses an index in the support of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the first i iterations, see Theorems 9 and 10. Moreover, we show that this condition is tight, see Theorem 11. To the best of the authors' knowledge, our results on partial recovery of sparse signals with BOMP haven't been reported before.

As far as we know, the sharp sufficient condition for recovering the α-strongly-decaying sparse vectors by solving the ℓ_1-minimization problem (3) is still $\delta_{2K}<\sqrt{2}/2$. Thus, our sufficient condition for BOMP is weaker for recovering this class of sparse vectors and this further convinces the effectiveness of the BOMP algorithm. It is worthy to mention that the BOMP algorithm has better reconstruction properties than the standard OMP algorithm (for more details, see, [32]), and block-RIP has advantages over standard RIP (for more details, see, [35]).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section II, we define some notations and give some useful lemmas that will be needed to prove our main results. We present our main results in Section III and prove them Section IV. Finally, we summarize this paper and present some future research problems in Section V.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first introduce some notations which will be used in the rest of this paper.

Notation: Let $\mathbb{R}$ be the real field. Boldface lowercase letters denote column vectors, and boldface uppercase letters denote matrices, e.g., $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. For a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, x_i denotes the i-th entry of $\boldsymbol{x}$. Let $\boldsymbol{e}_k$ denote the k-th column of the identity matrix $\boldsymbol{I}$ and $\boldsymbol{0}$ denote a zero matrix or a zero vector. Let $\Omega = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the support set of block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$. Then $|\Omega| \leq K$ for any K block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$, where $|\Omega|$ is the cardinality of Ω. Let $\Omega \setminus S = \{k | k \in \Omega, k \notin S\}$ for set S. Let Ω^c and S^c be the complement of Ω and S, i.e., $\Omega^c = \{1, 2, \ldots, L\} \setminus \Omega$, and $S^c = \{1, 2, \ldots, L\} \setminus S$, where $n = Ld$ with d being the size of the blocks. Let $\boldsymbol{A}[S]$ be the submatrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$ that contains only the blocks of columns indexed by $\boldsymbol{S}$, and $\boldsymbol{x}[S]$ be the subvector of $\boldsymbol{x}$ that contains only the blocks indexed by $\boldsymbol{S}$, and $\boldsymbol{A}^\top[S]$ be the transpose of $\boldsymbol{A}[S]$. For $1 \leq i \leq L, 1 \leq j \leq d$, $(\boldsymbol{A}[i])_j$ denotes the j-th column of $\boldsymbol{A}[i]$. For full column rank matrix $\boldsymbol{A}[S]$, let $\boldsymbol{P}[S] = \boldsymbol{A}[S](\boldsymbol{A}[S]^\top \boldsymbol{A}[S])^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}[S]^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S] = \boldsymbol{I} - \boldsymbol{P}[S]$ denote the projector and orthogonal complement projector on the column space of $\boldsymbol{A}[S]$, respectively.

Next we introduce the ℓ_2/ℓ_p-norm for block vectors and some useful lemmas.

A. ℓ_2/ℓ_p-norm

Like in [32] and [44], for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define a general mixed ℓ_2/ℓ_p-norm (where $p = 1, 2, \infty$) as:

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,p} = \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_p, \tag{9}$$

where $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ with $w_i = \|\boldsymbol{x}[l]\|_2$ for $1 \leq l \leq L$. Note that

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,2} = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2.$$

Thus, we use $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2$ instead of $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,2}$ for short. Moreover, if the block size $d = 1$, then for $p = 1, 2, \infty$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,p} = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2.$$

B. Some Useful Lemmas

By [48, Lemma 1], [49, Proposition 3.1] and [50, Lemma 1], we can easily get the following lemmas.

Lemma 1: If $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP of orders K_1 and K_2 with $K_1 < K_2$, then $\delta_{K_1} \leq \delta_{K_2}$.

Lemma 2: Let $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfy the block-RIP of order K and S be a set with $|S| \leq K$. Then for any $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}[S]^\top \boldsymbol{x}[S]\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_K)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

Lemma 3: Let sets S_1, S_2 satisfy $|S_2 \setminus S_1| \geq 1$ and matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfy the block-RIP of order $|S_1 \cup S_2|$. Then for any vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_2 \setminus S_1| \times d}$,

$$(1 - \delta_{|S_1 \cup S_2|})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_1]\boldsymbol{A}[S_2 \setminus S_1]\boldsymbol{x}[S_2 \setminus S_1]\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_{|S_1 \cup S_2|})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

III. MAIN RESULTS

A. An All-Purpose Sufficient Condition

In this subsection, we give an all-purpose sufficient condition for the recovery of K block sparse signals with the BOMP algorithm. We start with a useful lemma whose proof will be provided in Section IV-A.

Lemma 4: Let $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfy the block-RIP of order $K + 1$ with $\delta_{K+1} \in [0, 1)$ and S be a subset of Ω with $|S| < |\Omega|$. If $\boldsymbol{x}$ in (1) satisfies

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2 \leq \nu\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2^2 \tag{10}$$

for some $\nu \geq 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,\infty} - \|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \geq&\frac{(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2}{\sqrt{\nu}}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Remark 1: If S in Lemma 4 is an empty set, then (11) reduces to

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega]\|_{2,\infty} - \|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega]\|_{2,\infty} \geq \frac{(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}_\Omega\|_2}{\sqrt{\nu}}.$$

Remark 2: If $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfies the block-RIP of order $K+1$ with

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\nu+1}},$$

then under the assumptions of Lemma 4, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,\infty} > \|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}.$$

By Lemma 4, we can get the following all-purpose sufficient condition for the recovery of K-block sparse signals with BOMP algorithm.

Theorem 1: Let $f(t)$ be a nondecreasing function of $t > 0$ that satisfies $0 < f(t) \leq t$. Suppose that in (1), $\boldsymbol{x}$ satisfies

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2 \leq f(|\Omega| - |S|)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2^2 \tag{12}$$

for any S which is a subset of the support Ω of the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ with $|S| < |\Omega|$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{v}$ satisfies $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ and $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{f(K)+1}}. \tag{13}$$

Then, the BOMP algorithm with the stopping criterion $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\| \leq \epsilon$ exactly recovers Ω in K iterations provided that

$$\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2 > \frac{2\epsilon}{1-\sqrt{f(K)+1}\delta_{K+1}}. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the recovery error can be bounded by

$$\|\boldsymbol{x} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2 \leq \epsilon. \tag{15}$$

The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section IV-B.

Remark 3: By (9) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is easy to see that (12) always holds if $f(t) = t$. So, it is not necessary to consider the case that $f(t) > t$ and this is the reason why we assume $f(t) \leq t$.

B. Recovery of General Block Sparse Signals

In this subsection, we study the recovery of regular block sparse signals. On the one hand, we will show that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} < 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, then the BOMP Algorithm exactly or stably (under some conditions on $\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2$) recovers K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations. On the other hand, we will show that if $\delta_{K+1} \geq 1/\sqrt{K+1}$, then the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover a K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations.

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (9), it is easy to see that (12) holds if $f(t) = t$. Consequently, we obtain Theorems 2 and 3 below from Theorem 1.

Theorem 2: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}. \tag{16}$$

Then, the BOMP algorithm exactly recovers K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations when $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{0}$.

Theorem 3: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ in (1) respectively satisfy the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (16) and $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. Then, the BOMP algorithm with the stopping criterion $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\| \leq \epsilon$ exactly recovers the support Ω of the K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations provided that

$$\min_{i\in\Omega} \|x[i]\|_2 > \frac{2\epsilon}{1-\sqrt{K+1}\delta_{K+1}}.$$

Moreover, the recovery error can be bounded by (15).

When the block size $d = 1$, the block-RIP reduces to the classic RIP and the BOMP algorithm reduces to the OMP algorithm. Then Theorems 2 and 3 are just [26, Theorm III.1] and [51, Theorm 1], respectively.

In the following, we give a necessary condition in terms of RIC for exact recovery by using the BOMP algorithm. More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4: For any given positive integers $d, K \geq 1$ and any

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}} \leq t < 1, \tag{17}$$

there always exist a K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ and a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$ such that the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations.

The proof of Theorem 4 is given in Sec. IV-C. Of course, when the block size $d = 1$, the results in Theorem 4 reduce to [27, Theorm 1].

Remark 4: From Theorems 2 and 4, we can see that (16) is a sharp sufficient condition for recovering K-block sparse signals by the BOMP algorithm in K iterations.

C. Recovery of Block Strongly-Decaying Sparse Signals

In this subsection, we will show that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$, then the BOMP algorithm exactly or stably (under some constraints on $\min_{i\in\Omega} \|x[i]\|_2$) recovers all α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signals in K iterations if α is larger than a value related to δ_{K+1}. Furthermore, we will show that if $\delta_{K+1} \geq \sqrt{2}/2$, the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover a α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations, regardless how large is α. Moreover, the condition on α is also sharp.

Let us introduce Lemma 5 below, whose proof is given in Sec. IV-D.

Lemma 5: For $1 \leq i \leq K$ and $t > 1$, let

$$g_i(t) = \frac{(t^i-1)(t+1)}{(t^i+1)(t-1)}. \tag{18}$$

Then,

$$1 = g_1(t) \leq g_2(t) \leq \ldots \leq g_K(t). \tag{19}$$

Moreover, $g_i(t)$ is strictly decreasing with t and $1 < g_i(t) < i$ for $2 < i \leq K$.

By Lemma 5, for each $1 < s < K$, $g_K(t) = s$ has a unique solution which is denoted by t_s. To simplify the notation, we define

$$g_K^{-1}(s) = \begin{cases} t_s, & 1 < s < K \\ 1, & s \geq K. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Note that $g_K^{-1}(s)$ can be easily computed, for example, using Newton's method for the zeros of nonlinear function g_K.

Therefore, by (20) and Theorem 1, we can obtain the following results.

Theorem 5: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying

$$\delta_{K+1} < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}. \tag{21}$$

If $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal (see Definition 1) with

$$\alpha > g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1), \tag{22}$$

the BOMP algorithm exactly recovers $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations when $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{0}$.

In fact, Theorem 5 is a direct consequence of Theorem 6 below.

Theorem 6: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ in (1) respectively satisfy the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (21) and $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. If $\boldsymbol{x}$ is a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal with α satisfying (22), then BOMP with the stopping criterion $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\| \leq \epsilon$ exactly recovers the support Ω of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations provided that

$$\min_{i\in\Omega} \|x[i]\|_2 > \frac{2\epsilon}{1 - \sqrt{1 + \min\{s^{-2} - 1, K\}}\delta_{K+1}},$$

where s satisfies

$$\delta_{K+1} < s < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2},\ \ g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1) < g_K^{-1}(s^{-2} - 1) \leq \alpha. \tag{23}$$

Moreover, the recovery error can be bounded by (15).

The proof of Theorem 6 is given in Sec. IV-E.

Remark 5: By (20), for each $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$, $g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1)$ is well defined. By Lemma 5, $g_K(t)$ is strictly decreasing with t, so $g_K^{-1}(s)$ is strictly decreasing with s. Therefore, for each $\alpha > g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1)$, there exists s such that (23) holds.

Remark 6: It was shown in [21, Theorem 4.1] that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfies the RIP with $\delta_{K+1} < 1/3$, and $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal with

$$\alpha > \frac{1 + 2\frac{\delta_{K+1}}{1-\delta_{K+1}}\sqrt{K-1}}{1 - 2\frac{\delta_{K+1}}{1-\delta_{K+1}}}, \tag{24}$$

the OMP algorithm exactly recovers $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations when $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{0}$.

If the block side $d = 1$, then the sufficient condition given by Theorem 5 is the condition for recovering α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signals by using the OMP algorithm. Obviously, our condition on δ_{K+1} is much weaker. In the following, let us show our condition on α is also weaker than [21, Theorem 4.1]. Clearly, we need to show

$$\frac{1 + 2\frac{\delta_{K+1}}{1-\delta_{K+1}}\sqrt{K-1}}{1 - 2\frac{\delta_{K+1}}{1-\delta_{K+1}}} > g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{1 - \delta_{K+1} + 2\delta_{K+1}\sqrt{K-1}}{1 - 3\delta_{K+1}} > g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1).$$

By the previous analysis, $g_K^{-1}(s)$ is decreasing with s. Thus, we only need to show

$$g_K\left(\frac{1 - \delta_{K+1} + 2\delta_{K+1}\sqrt{K-1}}{1 - 3\delta_{K+1}}\right) < \delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1.$$

By (18), the above inequality holds if

$$\frac{\frac{1-\delta_{K+1}+2\delta_{K+1}\sqrt{K-1}}{1-3\delta_{K+1}} + 1}{\frac{1-\delta_{K+1}+2\delta_{K+1}\sqrt{K-1}}{1-3\delta_{K+1}} - 1} < \delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1,$$

i.e.,

$$\frac{1-2\delta_{K+1}+\delta_{K+1}\sqrt{K-1}}{\delta_{K+1}(1+\sqrt{K-1})}<\frac{1-\delta_{K+1}^2}{\delta_{K+1}^2}.$$

To show the aforementioned inequality, it is equivalently to show

$$2\delta_{K+1}^2\sqrt{K-1}<(1+2\delta_{K+1}^2-\delta_{K+1})+\sqrt{K-1}.$$

It is clear to see that when $\delta_{K+1}<\sqrt{2}/2$, the inequality above holds. In other words, our sufficient condition given by Theorem 5 is weaker than [21, Theorem 4.1] in terms of both δ_{K+1} and α.

In the following, we give two necessary conditions in terms of RIC and α for exact recovery of block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signals by using the BOMP algorithm.

Theorem 7: For any given positive integers $d, K\geq 1$, any given $\alpha>1$ and any

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\leq t<1, \tag{25}$$

there always exist a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal and a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}=t$ such that the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations.

The proof of Theorem 7 is given in Sec. IV-F. Let

$$\delta_{K+1}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}.$$

By (20), we have

$$g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2}-1)=g_K^{-1}(K)=1.$$

Then, a $g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2}-1)$-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal is a regular K-block sparse signal. From Theorem 4, we can easily obtain the following result.

Theorem 8: For any given positive integers $d, K\geq 1$, there exist a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (21), and a block α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal with

$$\alpha=g_K^{-1}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2}-1) \tag{26}$$

such that the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover $\boldsymbol{x}$ in K iterations.

Remark 7: From Theorems 5, 7 and 8, we can see that (21) is a sharp sufficient condition for recovering an α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the K iterations by the BOMP algorithm.

D. Partial Recovery of Block Sparse Signals

Finally, we will show that if $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1}<\sqrt{2}/2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{x}[j]\|_2/\|\boldsymbol{x}[j+1]\|_2, 1\leq j\leq i$ satisfy some conditions for some $1\leq i\leq K$, the BOMP algorithm will choose some indices in the support of $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the first i iterations. Moreover, we will show that this condition is sharp.

Before presenting some sufficient conditions, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 6: For $t>1$, let

$$\hat{h}_i(t)=\frac{(t+i)^2}{t^2+i},\quad 1\leq i\leq K-1. \tag{27}$$

Then, for $1\leq i\leq K-1$, $\hat{h}_i$ is strictly decreasing with t, and $1<\hat{h}_i(t)<1+i$.

Moreover, for each $1<s<1+i$, $\hat{h}_i(t)=s$ if and only if $t=h_i(s)$, where for $1\leq i\leq K-1$,

$$h_i(s)=\begin{cases}\frac{i+\sqrt{i^2s+(s-s^2)i}}{s-1}, & 1<s<1+i\\ 1, & s=i+1.\end{cases} \tag{28}$$

Note that for each $1\leq i\leq K-1$ and $1<s<1+i$, we have $i^2s+(s-s^2)i=is[(i+1)-s]>0$. Thus, (28) is well-defined.

Proof. By some simple calculations and the assumption that $t > 1$, we have:

$$\hat{h}_i(t)' = \frac{2(t+i)(1-t)i}{(t^2+i)^2} < 0.$$

Thus, $\hat{h}_i$ is strictly decreasing with t. It is easy to see that

$$\hat{h}_i(1) = 1 + i, \quad \lim_{t\to+\infty} \hat{h}_i(t) = 1.$$

Thus, $1 < \hat{h}_i(t) < 1 + i$. For each $1 < s < 1 + i$, it is straightforward to solve the quadratic equation $\hat{h}(t) = s$ which yields (28). □

Therefore, by (28) and Theorem 1, we obtain the following sufficient conditions for partial recovery by the BOMP algorithm.

Theorem 9: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ in (1) satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (21). Suppose the K-block sparse $\boldsymbol{x}$ satisfies

$$\|x[j]\|_2 > h_{(K-j)}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1)\|x[j+1]\|_2, \quad 1 \le j \le i. \tag{29}$$

Then, the BOMP algorithm will choose an index in the support Ω (see line 2 of Algorithm 1) in the first i iterations when $\boldsymbol{v} = \mathbf{0}$.

Theorem 9 is a direct consequence of Theorem 10 below when $\boldsymbol{v} = 0$.

Theorem 10: Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (21) and and $\boldsymbol{v}$ in (1) is bounded, i.e. $\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \le \epsilon$. If K-block sparse $\boldsymbol{x}$ satisfies (29), then, the BOMP algorithm will choose an index in the support Ω in the first i iterations provided that

$$\min_{i\in\Omega} \|x[i]\|_2 > \frac{2\epsilon}{1 - \sqrt{1 + \min\{s^{-2} - 1, K\}}\delta_{K+1}},$$

where s satisfies $\delta_{K+1} < s < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ and

$$h_{K-j}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1) < h_{K-j}(s^{-2} - 1) \le \min_{1\le j\le i} \frac{\|x[j]\|_2}{\|x[j+1]\|_2}. \tag{30}$$

The proof of Theorem 10 is given in Sec. IV-G.

Remark 8: By Lemma 6, $\hat{h}_j(t)$ is strictly decreasing with t for $1 \le j \le K - 1$, so $h_j(s)$ is strictly decreasing with s. Therefore, there exists s such that (30) holds.

In the following, we give a necessary condition for partial recovery of K-block sparse signals by using the BOMP algorithm. Let

$$\delta_{K+1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}.$$

By (28), we have

$$h_{(K-1)}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1) = h_{K-1}(K) = 1.$$

Thus, from the proof of Theorem 3, we can easily get the following result.

Theorem 11: For any given positive integers $d, K \ge 1$, there exist a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfying the block-RIP with δ_{K+1} satisfying (21), and a K-block sparse signal with

$$\|x[1]\|_2 = h_{(K-1)}(\delta_{K+1}^{-2} - 1)\|x[2]\|_2 \tag{31}$$

such that the BOMP algorithm may fail to choose an index in the support Ω in the first iteration.

Remark 9: From Theorems 9, 10 and 11, we can see that Theorem 9 gives a sharp sufficient condition for partial recovery of K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$.

IV. PROOFS

In this section, we mainly prove the main results given in Section III. We devote each subsection to one of the proofs.

A. Proof of Lemma 4

Proof. Obviously, to show (11), it suffices to show that for each $j \in \Omega^c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}-\|\boldsymbol{A}[j]^\top\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\\ \geq&\frac{(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2}{\sqrt{\nu}}.\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \overset{(a)}{\geq}&\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,1}\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \overset{(b)}{=}&\Big(\sum_{l\in\Omega\setminus S}\|\boldsymbol{x}[l]\|_2\Big)\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \overset{(c)}{\geq}&\sum_{l\in\Omega\setminus S}\big(\|\boldsymbol{x}[l]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[l]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\big)\\ \overset{(d)}{\geq}&\sum_{l\in\Omega\setminus S}\big(|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[l]\boldsymbol{A}^\top[l]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]|\big)\\ \overset{(e)}{=}&\sum_{l\in\Omega\setminus S}\big(\boldsymbol{x}^\top[l]\boldsymbol{A}^\top[l](\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S])^T\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\big)\\ =&\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where (a) and (b) respectively follow from (10) and (9); (c) is because for each $l\in\Omega\setminus S$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}\geq\|\boldsymbol{A}[l]^T\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2;$$

(d) is from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and (e) is because of the projection property:

$$(\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S])^\top\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]=\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]=\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S].\tag{33}$$

Thus, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\leq\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]^T\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}.\tag{34}$$

Let

$$\mu=-\frac{\sqrt{\nu+1}-1}{\sqrt{\nu}}.$$

By a simple calculation, we have

$$\frac{2\mu}{1-\mu^2}=-\sqrt{\nu},\quad\frac{1+\mu^2}{1-\mu^2}=\sqrt{\nu+1}.\tag{35}$$

To simplify notation, we define $\boldsymbol{h}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$h_i=\frac{(\boldsymbol{A}[j])_i^\top\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]}{\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2},\quad 1\leq i\leq d.$$

Then, it is easy to see that

$$\boldsymbol{h}^T\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]=\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2, \tag{36}$$

and $\|\boldsymbol{h}\|_2=1$. Furthermore, we define two sparse vectors

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{u}&=\begin{bmatrix}\boldsymbol{x}^\top[\Omega\setminus S] & \boldsymbol{0}^T\end{bmatrix}^\top\in\mathbb{R}^{(|\Omega\setminus S|+1)d},\\ \boldsymbol{w}&=\begin{bmatrix}\boldsymbol{0}^T & \mu\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\boldsymbol{h}\end{bmatrix}^\top\in\mathbb{R}^{(|\Omega\setminus S|+1)d}.\end{aligned}$$

For given $j\in\Omega^c$, we let

$$\boldsymbol{B}=\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[(\Omega\setminus S)\cup j]=\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[(\Omega\cup j)\setminus S], \tag{37}$$

where the second equality is because $j\in\Omega^c$ and $S\subset\Omega$. Then,

$$\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]=\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}, \tag{38}$$

and

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2=(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2, \tag{39}$$

$$\|\mu^2\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2=\mu^2(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2. \tag{40}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{w}^\top\boldsymbol{B}^\top\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}&\overset{(a)}{=}\boldsymbol{w}^\top\boldsymbol{A}^\top[(\Omega\setminus S)\cup j](\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S])^\top\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\\ &\overset{(b)}{=}\boldsymbol{w}^\top\boldsymbol{A}^\top[(\Omega\setminus S)\cup j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\\ &=\mu\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\boldsymbol{h}^\top\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\\ &\overset{(c)}{=}\mu\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2,\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from (37) and (38); and (b) and (c), respectively follow from (33) and (36). Therefore, for given $j\in\Omega^c$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2=&\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2+\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2+2\boldsymbol{w}^T\boldsymbol{B}^T\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\\ =&\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2+\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2+2\mu\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\boldsymbol{B}(\mu^2\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2=\mu^4\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2+\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{w}\|_2^2-2\mu^3\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2.$$

Combining the two equations above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2-\|\boldsymbol{B}(\mu^2\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2\\ =&(1-\mu^4)\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2+2\mu(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\\ =&(1-\mu^4)(\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2+\frac{2\mu}{1-\mu^2}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2)\\ =&(1-\mu^4)(\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2-\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2),\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where the last equality follows from the first equality in (35).

On the other hand, using (37) and Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2-\|\boldsymbol{B}(\mu^2\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2\\
\overset{(a)}{\geq}&(1-\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|(\boldsymbol{u}+\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2-(1+\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|(\mu^2\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{w})\|_2^2\\
\overset{(b)}{=}&(1-\delta_{|\Omega|+1})(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2-(1+\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\mu^2(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\\
=&(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big((1-\delta_{|\Omega|+1})-(1+\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\mu^2\big)\\
=&(1+\mu^2)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big((1-\mu^2)-\delta_{|\Omega|+1}(1+\mu^2)\big)\\
=&(1-\mu^4)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big(1-\frac{1+\mu^2}{1-\mu^2}\delta_{|\Omega|+1}\big)\\
\overset{(c)}{=}&(1-\mu^4)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1}\big),
\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 3 and (37), (b) follows from (39) and (40), and (c) follows from the second equality in (35).

By (38), (41), (42) and the fact that $1-\mu^4>0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2-\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[j]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\\
=&\|\boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2-\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[j]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\\
\geq&\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining with (34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{\nu}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\big(\|\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]^T\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,\infty}-\|\boldsymbol{A}[j]^T\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2\big)\\
\geq&\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2\big(1-\sqrt{\nu+1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (32) holds and hence, (11) follows. □

B. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. We first prove the first part of the results in Theorem 1. The proof consists of two steps. In the first step, we show that the BOMP algorithm selects correct indexes in all iterations. In the second step, we prove that it performs exactly $|\Omega|$ iterations.

We prove the first step by induction. Suppose that the BOMP algorithm selects correct indexes in the first $k-1$ iterations, i.e., $S_{k-1}\subseteq\Omega$ for $1\leq k\leq|\Omega|$. Then, we need to show that the BOMP algorithm selects a correct index in the k-th iteration, i.e., by Algorithm 1, we show that $s^k\in\Omega$.

By Algorithm 1, it is easy to see that

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}]\|_2=0.$$

Thus, by line 2 of Algorithm 1, to show $s^k\in\Omega$, it suffices to show

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}>\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}.\tag{43}$$

By line 4 of Algorithm 1, we have

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}[S_{k-1}]=(\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}])^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{y}.\tag{44}$$

Thus, by line 5 of Algorithm 1 and (44), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}&=\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}]\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}[S_{k-1}]\\
&=\big(\boldsymbol{I}-\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}](\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}])^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[S_{k-1}]\big)\boldsymbol{y}\\
&\overset{(a)}{=}\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}](\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{v})\overset{(b)}{=}\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}](\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega]+\boldsymbol{v})\\
&\overset{(c)}{=}\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}](\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[S_{k-1}]+\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]+\boldsymbol{v})\\
&\overset{(d)}{=}\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]+\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v},
\end{aligned}\tag{45}$$

where (a), (b), (c) and (d) follows from the definition of $\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]$, the fact that $\Omega = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{x})$, the induction assumption $S_{k-1} \subseteq \Omega$ and $\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[S_{k-1}] = \boldsymbol{0}$, respectively.

Thus, by (45), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \geq&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty} - \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty},\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

for the left-hand side of (43), and for the right-hand side of (43), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{r}^{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}\\ \leq&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty} + \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty}.\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Therefore, by (46) and (47), in order to show (43), we show

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}\\ &\quad - \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{2,\infty}\\ >&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty} + \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty}.\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

By induction assumption $S_{k-1} \subseteq \Omega$, we have

$$|\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}])| = |\Omega| + 1 - k. \tag{49}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_2 &\geq \sqrt{|\Omega| + 1 - k} \min_{i \in \Omega \setminus S_{k-1}} \|x[i]\|_2\\ &\geq \sqrt{|\Omega| + 1 - k} \min_{i \in \Omega} \|x[i]\|_2 \geq \sqrt{f(|\Omega| + 1 - k)} \min_{i \in \Omega} \|x[i]\|_2,\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $f(t) \leq t$ for $t > 0$.

In the following, we shall give a lower bound on the left-hand side of (48) and an upper bound on the right-hand side of (48). To bound the left-hand side of (48), we use Lemma 4 and (12) to have, since $S_{k-1} \subseteq \Omega$ and $|S_{k-1}| = k - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{\infty}\\ &\quad - \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_{\infty}\\ \geq&\frac{(1 - \sqrt{f(|\Omega| + 1 - k) + 1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_2}{\sqrt{f(|\Omega| + 1 - k)}}\\ \overset{(a)}{\geq}&\frac{(1 - \sqrt{f(K) + 1}\delta_{|\Omega|+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_2}{\sqrt{f(|\Omega| + 1 - k)}}\\ \overset{(b)}{\geq}&\frac{(1 - \sqrt{f(K) + 1}\delta_{K+1})\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\|_2}{\sqrt{f(|\Omega| + 1 - k)}} \overset{(c)}{\geq} (1 - \sqrt{f(K) + 1}\delta_{K+1}) \min_{i \in \Omega} \|x[i]\|_2,\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

where (a) is because $k \geq 1$, $\boldsymbol{x}$ is K-block sparse (i.e., $|\Omega| \leq K$) and $f(t)$ is nondecreasing; (b) follows from Lemma 1; and (c) follows from (13) and (50).

To give an upper bound on the right-hand side of (48), we notice that there exist $i_0 \in \Omega \setminus S_{k-1}$ and $j_0 \in \Omega^c$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega \setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty} &= \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[i_0]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2,\\ \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty} &= \|\boldsymbol{A}^{\top}[j_0]\boldsymbol{P}^{\perp}[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega\setminus S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty}+\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega^c]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,\infty}\\
=&\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[i_0]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2+\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[j_0]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\\
=&\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[i_0\cup j_0]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_{2,1}\overset{(a)}{\leq}\sqrt{2}\|\boldsymbol{A}^\top[i_0\cup j_0]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\\
\overset{(b)}{\leq}&\sqrt{2(1+\delta_{K+1})}\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\overset{(c)}{\leq}\sqrt{2(1+\delta_{K+1})}\epsilon,
\end{aligned}\tag{52}$$

where (a) is from (9) and the fact that $\boldsymbol{A}^\top[i_0\cup j_0]\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}$ is a 2×1 block vector, (b) follows from Lemma 2 and (c) is because

$$\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\leq\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{k-1}]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\leq\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\leq\epsilon.\tag{53}$$

From (51) and (52), we can see that (48) (or equivalently (43)) is guaranteed by

$$(1-\sqrt{f(K)+1}\delta_{K+1})\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2>\sqrt{2(1+\delta_{K+1})}\epsilon,$$

i.e., by (13),

$$\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2>\frac{\sqrt{2(1+\delta_{K+1})}\epsilon}{1-\sqrt{f(K)+1}\delta_{K+1}}.$$

Thus, if (14) holds, then the BOMP algorithm selects a correct index in the kth iteration.

Next we need to show that the BOMP algorithm performs exactly $|\Omega|$ iterations, which is equivalent to show that $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\|_2>\epsilon$ for $1\leq k<|\Omega|$ and $\|\boldsymbol{r}^{|\Omega|}\|_2\leq\epsilon$. Since the BOMP algorithm selects a correct index in each iteration under (14), by (45), for $1\leq k<|\Omega|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\|_2&=\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_k]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S_k]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S_k]+\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_k]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\\
&\geq\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_k]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S_k]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S_k]\|_2-\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_k]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\\
&\overset{(a)}{\geq}\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_k]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega\setminus S_k]\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S_k]\|_2-\epsilon\\
&\overset{(b)}{\geq}\sqrt{1-\delta_{|\Omega|}}\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus\ S_k]\|_2-\epsilon\overset{(c)}{\geq}\sqrt{1-\delta_{K+1}}\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2-\epsilon,
\end{aligned}\tag{54}$$

where (a), (b) and (c) are respectively from (53), Lemma 3 and Lemma 1; Therefore, if

$$\min_{i\in\Omega}\|x[i]\|_2>\frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-\delta_{K+1}}},\tag{55}$$

then $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\|_2>\epsilon$ for $1\leq k<\Omega$.

By a simple calculation, we can show that

$$\frac{2\epsilon}{1-\sqrt{f(K)+1}\delta_{K+1}}\geq\frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{1-\delta_{K+1}}}.\tag{56}$$

Indeed, we have

$$1-\sqrt{f(K)+1}\delta_{K+1}\leq 1-\delta_{K+1}\leq\sqrt{1-\delta_{K+1}}.$$

Thus, (56) follows. Therefore, by (55) and (56), if (14) holds, then $\|\boldsymbol{r}^k\|_2>\epsilon$ for $1\leq k<\Omega$, i.e., the BOMP algorithm does not terminate before the $|\Omega|$-th iteration.

Similarly, by (45), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{r}^{|\Omega|}\|_2=\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp_{S_{|\Omega|}}\boldsymbol{A}_{\Omega\setminus S_{|\Omega|}}\boldsymbol{x}_{\Omega\setminus S_{|\Omega|}}+\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{|\Omega|}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\overset{(a)}{=}\|\boldsymbol{P}^\perp[S_{|\Omega|}]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2\overset{(b)}{\leq}\epsilon,\tag{57}$$

where (a) is because $S_{|\Omega|} = |\Omega|$ and (b) follows from (53). So, by the stopping condition, the BOMP algorithm terminates after performing the $|\Omega|$-th iteration in total. That is, the BOMP algorithm performs $|\Omega|$ iterations.

Next let us prove the second part, i.e. (15) of Theorem 1. Since the support of the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be exactly recovered by the BOMP algorithm, we get

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{x}} = (\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega])^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega]\boldsymbol{y} = (\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega]\boldsymbol{A}[\Omega])^{-1}\boldsymbol{A}^\top[\Omega](\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{v}) = \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{P}[\Omega]\boldsymbol{v}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{x} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{P}[\Omega]\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2 \leq \epsilon.$$

This completes the proof. □

C. Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. For any given positive integer $K \geq 1$, let matrix function

$$\boldsymbol{B}(d) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{K}{K+1}\boldsymbol{I}_{dK} & \frac{\boldsymbol{E}_{(dK)\times d}}{K+1} \\ \frac{\boldsymbol{E}^T_{(dK)\times d}}{K+1} & \frac{K+2}{K+1}\boldsymbol{I}_d, \end{bmatrix}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{E}_{(dK)\times d} = (\boldsymbol{I}_d, \ldots, \boldsymbol{I}_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(dK)\times d}, \tag{58}$$

with $\boldsymbol{I}_d$ being the $d-$dimensional identity matrix.

Let

$$s = t - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}, \quad \boldsymbol{C}(d) = \boldsymbol{B}(d) - s\boldsymbol{I}_{d(K+1)}. \tag{59}$$

And let

$$\boldsymbol{x}(d) = (\mathbf{1}_d, \ldots, \mathbf{1}_d, \mathbf{0}_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d(K+1)}, \tag{60}$$

where all the entries of $\mathbf{1}_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are 1. Then $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ is a K-block sparse signal.

In the following, we plan to show that $\boldsymbol{C}(d)$ is symmetric positive definite. Then there exists an upper triangular matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}^\top(d)\boldsymbol{A}(d) = \boldsymbol{C}(d)$. We will continue to show that $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$, and the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ from $\boldsymbol{y}(d) = \boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in K-iterations.

By some tedious calculations, it is not hard to show that the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{K+1}$ of $\boldsymbol{B}(1)$ are

$$\lambda_1 = \ldots = \lambda_{K-1} = \frac{K}{K+1},$$
$$\lambda_K = 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}},\ \lambda_{K+1} = 1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}.$$

To show $\boldsymbol{C}(d)$ is positive definite, we claim that for each $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)K}$,

$$(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{B}(d)\boldsymbol{x} \leq (1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2. \tag{61}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ with $u_i = v_i = \|\boldsymbol{x}[i]\|_2$ for $1 \le i \le K$ and $u_{K+1} = -v_{K+1} = \|\boldsymbol{x}[K+1]\|_2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{B}(d)\boldsymbol{x} \\
\overset{(a)}{=}&\frac{K}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\boldsymbol{x}[i] + \frac{K+2}{K+1}\boldsymbol{x}^\top[K+1]\boldsymbol{x}[K+1] + \frac{2}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}(\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\boldsymbol{x}[K+1]) \\
\overset{(b)}{\le}&\frac{K}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\|^2 + \frac{K+2}{K+1}\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[K+1]\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}(\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{x}[K+1]\|_2) \\
=&\frac{K}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}u_i^2 + \frac{K+2}{K+1}u_{K+1}^2 + \frac{2}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}(u_i u_{K+1}) \\
=&\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{B}(1)\boldsymbol{u} \le (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) and (b) respectively follow from (58) and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{x}^\top \boldsymbol{B}(d)\boldsymbol{x} \ge&\frac{K}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\|^2 + \frac{K+2}{K+1}\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[K+1]\|_2^2 - \frac{2}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}(\|\boldsymbol{x}^\top[i]\|_2\|\boldsymbol{x}[K+1]\|_2) \\
=&\frac{K}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}v_i^2 + \frac{K+2}{K+1}v_{K+1}^2 + \frac{2}{K+1}\sum_{i=1}^{K}(v_i v_{K+1}) \\
=&\boldsymbol{v}^T\boldsymbol{B}(1)\boldsymbol{v} \ge (1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_2^2 = (1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (61) follows. By (59) and (61), we have

$$(1-t)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \le \boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{C}(d)\boldsymbol{x} \le \left[1+(\frac{2}{\sqrt{K+1}}-t)\right]\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

By (17), we can see that $\boldsymbol{C}(d)$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Therefore, there exists an upper triangular matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}^\top(d)\boldsymbol{A}(d) = \boldsymbol{C}(d)$. Furthermore, $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} \le t$.

Next we need to show that $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} \ge t$, in fact $\delta_{K+1} = t$. By (61), it suffices to show there exists a $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)K}$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{B}(d)\boldsymbol{x} = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2$. Indeed, in this case, we will have

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 = \boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{C}(d)\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}^\top(\boldsymbol{B}(d)-s\boldsymbol{I}(d))\boldsymbol{x} = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}-s)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 = (1-t)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{K+1}$ be the eigenvector of $\boldsymbol{B}(1)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}}$. Then

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}^\top\boldsymbol{B}(1)\bar{\boldsymbol{u}} = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1)K}$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{x}[i] = \bar{u}_i\boldsymbol{e}_1$ ($e_1 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the first column of the $d \times d$ identity matrix) for $1 \le i \le K+1$. Then

$$\boldsymbol{x}^\top\boldsymbol{B}(d)\boldsymbol{x} = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_2^2 = (1+\frac{1}{\sqrt{K+1}})\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2.$$

Thus, $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$.

Finally, we show that BOMP may fail to recover the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ given in (60) from $\boldsymbol{y}(d) = \boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in K-iterations. By the fact that $\boldsymbol{A}^\top(d)\boldsymbol{A}(d) = \boldsymbol{C}(d)$ and $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in (60) we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{A}(d)^\top[K+1]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{A}(d)^\top[K+1]\boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 = \|(\boldsymbol{0}_{dK\times d}, \boldsymbol{I}_d)^\top\boldsymbol{C}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 = \frac{K\sqrt{d}}{K+1}.$$

Similarly, for $1 \leq i \leq K$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^\top[i]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 &= \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^\top[i]\boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 = \|(\boldsymbol{I}_d, \boldsymbol{0}_{dK\times d})^\top \boldsymbol{A}(d)^\top \boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 \\ &= (\frac{K}{K+1} - s)\sqrt{d}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $s \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\max_{i\in\Omega} \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^\top[i]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \leq \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^\top[K+1]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \leq \| \max_{j\in\Omega^c} \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[j]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2.$$

Therefore, the BOMP algorithm may fail in the first iteration. As a result, the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in K-iterations. □

D. Proof of Lemma 5

By (18), we have

$$g_i(t) = \frac{t+1}{t-1}\big(1 - \frac{2}{t^i+1}\big).$$

Since $t > 1$, it is easy to see that (19) holds.

In the following, let us show that $g_i(t)$ is strictly decreasing with t for $i \geq 2$. By (18) and a simple calculation, we have

$$g_i(t) = 1 + 2\phi(t) \text{ with } \phi(t) = \frac{(t^i - t)}{t^{i+1} - t^i + t - 1}.$$

Thus, we only need to show $\phi(t)$ is strictly decreasing with t for $i \geq 2$. Clearly, we have

$$\phi'(t) = \frac{\overline{\phi}(t)}{(t^{i+1} - t^i + t - 1)^2},$$

where

$$\overline{\phi}(t) = (1 + it^{i+1}) - (t^{2i} + it^{i-1}).$$

Thus, we only need to show $\overline{\phi}(t) < 0$ for $t > 1$ and $i \geq 2$. Since $\overline{\phi}(1) = 0$, let us show $\overline{\phi}'(t) < 0$ for $t > 1$ and $i \geq 2$. An elementary calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\phi}'(t) &= i(i+1)t^i - (2it^{2i-1} + i(i-1)t^{i-2}) \\ &= t^{i-2}i\big[(i+1)t^2 - (2t^{i+1} + i - 1))\big] < 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $g_i(t)$ is decreasing with t for $i \geq 2$. It follows that

$$\lim_{t\to 1} g_i(t) = i, \quad \lim_{t\to+\infty} g_i(t) = 1.$$

Thus, $1 < g_i(t) < i$ for $i \geq 2$. □

E. Proof of Theorem 6

Before proving Theorem 6, we introduce the following lemma which is a variant of [30, Lemma 1].

Lemma 7: Let $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta \geq \gamma > 1$ be given constants and let

$$\overline{g}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \beta, \gamma) = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j + \beta t_i)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j^2 + \gamma t_i^2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, \tag{62}$$

where

$$t_1 \geq \alpha t_2 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha^{K-1} t_K > 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{0} \cdot = 0. \tag{63}$$

Then, for $1 \leq i \leq K$, $\overline{g}_i$ is increasing with t_i. Moreover,

$$\overline{g}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, 1, 1) \leq g_i(\alpha), \tag{64}$$

where function g_i is defined in (18).

Proof. We first show that $\overline{g}_i$ is increasing with t_i. By (62), we have

$$\frac{\partial \overline{g}_i}{\partial t_i} = 2(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j + \beta t_i)\frac{\beta(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j^2 + \gamma t_i^2) - (\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j + \beta t_i)\gamma t_i}{(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j^2 + \gamma t_i^2)^2}.$$

By (63), and the facts that $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta \geq \gamma > 1$, it is easy to see that $\frac{\partial \overline{g}_i}{\partial t_i} > 0$, so $\overline{g}_i$ is increasing with t_i.

We now use induction to prove (64). Obviously, (64) holds with $i = 1$. Assume (64) holds for $i - 1$. Since $\overline{g}_i$ is increasing with t_i, by (63), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{g}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, 1, 1) \leq & \overline{g}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_{i-1}, \alpha^{-1} t_{i-1}, 1, 1) \\ = & \overline{g}_{i-1}(t_1, \ldots, t_{i-1}, (1 + \alpha^{-1}), (1 + \alpha^{-2})) \\ \leq & \ldots \leq \overline{g}_1(t_1, (\sum_{j=1}^{i} \alpha^{1-j}), (\sum_{j=1}^{i} \alpha^{2-2j})) = g_i(\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (64) follows for $1 \leq i \leq K$. We have thus completed the induction proof. □

Proof of Theorem 6. If $s^{-2} - 1 \geq K$, then $s \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+K}}$. By (23), $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+K}}$. Thus, by Theorem 3, Theorem 6 holds.

Next we consider the case that $s^{-2} - 1 < K$. By (20), we have

$$g_K(g_K^{-1}(s^{-2} - 1)) = s^{-2} - 1.$$

Let $f(t) = \min\{s^{-2} - 1, t\}$. By Theorem 1, it suffices to show (12) holds under (23) and (22).

By Definition 1, if $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal, so is $\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]$ for any subset S of Ω. By (62),

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2^2} = \overline{g}_{|\Omega \setminus S|}\big(\|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S])[1]\|_2, \ldots, \|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S])[|\Omega \setminus S|]\|_2, 1, 1\big).$$

Thus, by Lemmas 5 and 7 as well as (23) and (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2^2} \leq & g_{|\Omega \setminus S|}(\alpha) \leq g_{|\Omega \setminus S|}(g_K^{-1}(s^{-2} - 1)) \\ \leq & g_K(g_K^{-1}(s^{-2} - 1)) = s^{-2} - 1.\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, obviously,

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2 \leq (|\Omega| - |S|)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega \setminus S]\|_2^2.$$

That is, the above two inequalities show that (12) holds with $f(t) = \min\{s^{-2} - 1, t\}$. Theorem 1 can be applied and hence, Theorem 6 holds. □

F. Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. For any given positive integer $K \geq 1$, and $\alpha > 1$, let

$$\boldsymbol{B}(d) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1+\sqrt{2}-2t}{2}\boldsymbol{I}_d & \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{I}_d & \mathbf{0}_d \\ \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{I}_d & \frac{3+\sqrt{2}-2t}{2}\boldsymbol{I}_d & \mathbf{0}_d \\ \mathbf{0}_{d(K-1)\times d} & \mathbf{0}_{d(K-1)\times d} & \frac{1+\sqrt{2}-2t}{2}\boldsymbol{I}_{d(K-1)}, \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{x}(d) = (a_1\mathbf{1}_d, \mathbf{0}_d, a_2\mathbf{1}_d, \ldots, a_K\mathbf{1}_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{d(K+1)},$$

where all the entries of $\mathbf{1}_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are 1, and

$$a_1 \geq \alpha a_2 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha^{K-1}a_K.$$

Thus, $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ is an α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal.

Following the proof of Theorem 4, one can easily show that $\boldsymbol{B}(d)$ is symmetric positive definite. Thus, there exists an upper triangular matrix $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}^\top(d)\boldsymbol{A}(d) = \boldsymbol{B}(d)$. Moreover, one can similarly show that $\boldsymbol{A}(d)$ satisfies the block-RIP with $\delta_{K+1} = t$.

In the following, we show BOMP may fail to recover the K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ from $\boldsymbol{y}(d) = \boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in K-iterations.

By the fact that $\boldsymbol{A}(d)^T\boldsymbol{A}(d) = \boldsymbol{B}(d)$, we have

$$\|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[2]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 = \|(\mathbf{0}_{d\times d}, \boldsymbol{I}_d, \mathbf{0}_{d(K-1)\times d})(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T\boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 = \frac{1}{2}a_1\sqrt{d}.$$

Similarly, for $i \in \Omega$

$$\|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[i]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 = \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[i]\boldsymbol{A}(d)\boldsymbol{x}(d)\|_2 = \frac{1+\sqrt{2}-2t}{2}a_i\sqrt{d}.$$

Thus, by (26)

$$\max_{i\in\Omega}\|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[i]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 = \|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[1]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2 \leq \max_{j\in\Omega^c}\|(\boldsymbol{A}(d))^T[j]\boldsymbol{y}\|_2.$$

Therefore, BOMP may fail in the first iteration. As a result, the BOMP algorithm may fail to recover the α-strongly-decaying K-sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}(d)$ in K-iterations. □

G. Proof of Theorem 10

Before proving Theorem 10, we introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 8: Let $\beta \geq 1$ be a given constant and let

$$\overline{h}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \beta) = \frac{(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j + \beta t_i)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} t_j^2 + \beta t_i^2}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, \tag{65}$$

where

$$t_1 \geq \alpha_1 t_2 \geq \ldots \geq \alpha_{K-1}t_K > 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{0} \cdot = 0. \tag{66}$$

for given $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{K-1} \geq 1$. Then, $\overline{h}_i$ is increasing with t_i. Moreover, for $2 \leq i \leq K$,

$$\overline{h}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, 1) = \hat{h}_{i-1}(t_1/t_2) \leq \hat{h}_{i-1}(\alpha_1), \tag{67}$$

where $\hat{h}_{i-1}$ is defined in (27).

Proof. It is easy to see that $\overline{h}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \beta) = \overline{g}_i(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \beta, \beta)$. The proof of Lemma 7 can be applied. Thus, $\overline{h}_i$ is increasing with t_i. Next we prove (67).

Since $\overline{h}_i$ is increasing with t_i, by (66) and the fact that $\alpha_i \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq K-1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{h}_i(t_1,\ldots,t_i,1) &\leq \overline{h}_i(t_1,\ldots,t_{i-1},t_{i-1},1)\\ &= \overline{h}_{i-1}(t_1,\ldots,t_{i-1},2)\\ &\leq \ldots \leq \overline{h}_2(t_1,t_2,i-1) \leq \hat{h}_{i-1}(\alpha_1).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 10. We prove it by induction. We first show that the BOMP algorithm chooses an index in Ω in the first iteration.

If $s^{-2}-1 \geq K$, then $s \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+K}}$. By (30), $\delta_{K+1} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+K}}$. Thus, by Theorem 2, the BOMP algorithm chooses an index in Ω in the first iteration.

If $s^{-2}-1 < K$, we let

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{\|x[1]\|_2}{\|x[2]\|_2}.$$

Let $f(t) = \min\{s^{-2}-1, t\}$. Thus, by Theorem 1, it suffices to show (12) holds under (29) with $S = \emptyset$ which is equivalent to show

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} \leq s^{-2}-1.$$

By Lemma 8 with $\alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_{K-1} = 1$, Lemma 6, (30) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2} &= \overline{h}_K\big(\|\boldsymbol{x}[1]\|_2,\ldots,\|\boldsymbol{x}[K],1\big)\\ &\leq \hat{h}_{(K-1)}(\alpha_1) \leq \hat{h}_{(K-1)}(h_{K-1}(s^{-2}-1)) = s^{-2}-1.\end{aligned}$$

Let us assume that the BOMP algorithm chooses an index in Ω in the first k iterations. Then, we show the BOMP chooses an index in Ω in the $(k+1)$-th iteration ($1 \leq k \leq i-1$).

Suppose S is the set of all the indexes chosen by the BOMP algorithm in the first k iterations. By Theorem 1, it suffices to show (12) holds under (29), which is equivalent to show

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2} \leq f(|\Omega\setminus S|) = \min\{s^{-2}-1, |\Omega|-|S|\}. \tag{68}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and (9), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2 \leq (|\Omega|-|S|)\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2.$$

Thus, if $s^{-2}-1 \geq K-|S| \geq |\Omega\setminus S|$, then (68) holds. Hence, we can use Theorem 1.

It remains to consider the case $s^{-2}-1 < K-|S|$. Let us prove

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2} \leq s^{-2}-1.$$

To this end let

$$\alpha_1 = \min_{1\leq j\leq k+1} \frac{\|x[j]\|_2}{\|x[j+1]\|_2}.$$

Then obviously, we have

$$\|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S])[1]\|_2 \geq \alpha_1\|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S])[2]\|_2. \tag{69}$$

Then, by Lemma 8 with $\alpha_2 = \ldots = \alpha_{K-(k+1)} = 1$, Lemma 6, (30) and (29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_{2,1}^2}{\|\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S]\|_2^2} =& \overline{h}_{K-k}\big(\|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S])[1]\|_2,\ldots,\|(\boldsymbol{x}[\Omega\setminus S])[K-k],1\big)\\ \leq& \hat{h}_{K-(k+1)}(\alpha_1) \leq \hat{h}_{(K-1)}(h_{K-1}(s^{-2}-1)) = s^{-2}-1.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have (68) and hence, we can apply Theorem 1. These complete the proof. □

V. Conclusions and Future Research

In this paper, we have studied Block-RIC based sufficient and necessary conditions for exactly and stably recovering K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ from the measurements $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{v}$ by the BOMP algorithm in K iterations, where $\boldsymbol{v}$ is a l_2 bounded noise vector. First, we have showed that $\delta_{K+1} < 1/\sqrt{K+1}$ is a sharp condition which is sufficient and necessary. Second, under a generous condition $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$, we present a class of K-block sparse signal which can be recovered exactly or stably by using the BOMP algorithm. That is, we have showed that under some conditions on α, the BOMP algorithm can exactly or stably recover any α-strongly-decaying K-block sparse signal in K iterations when $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$. Moreover, we have proved that the condition on α is sharp. Finally, we have shown that under a condition on blocks of K-block sparse signal $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\delta_{K+1} < \sqrt{2}/2$ is a sufficient condition for partial recovery of K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ by the BOMP algorithm. The condition on the blocks of K-block sparse signals $\boldsymbol{x}$ is also shown to be sharp for partial recovery.

It is possible to use more than K iterations of the OMP algorithm to recover a sparse signal as discussed in [52]–[54]. We are interested in extending our current work to this setting of study. We assume all the blocks have identical size of d in this paper. As a future work, we will extend our work to the case with non-uniform block sizes. Moreover, we are interested in investigating sufficient conditions of recovering α-strongly-decaying sparse signals by solving the ℓ_1-minimization problem in (3).

References

[1] E. J. Candés and T. Tao, "Decoding by linear programming," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 12, pp. 4203–4215, 2005.

[2] D. L. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 1289–1306, 2006.

[3] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. DeVore, "Compressed sensing and best k-term approximation," *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 22, pp. 211–231, 2009.

[4] Z. He, S. Xie, S. Ding, and A. Cichocki, "Convolutive blind source separation in the frequency domain based on sparse representation," *IEEE Trans. Audio, Speech, and Language Process.*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 1551–1563, 2007.

[5] M. Elad, M. A. Figueiredo, and Y. Ma, "On the role of sparse and redundant representations in image processing," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 98, no. 6, pp. 972–982, 2010.

[6] J. Wright, Y. Ma, J. Mairal, G. Sapiro, T. S. Huang, and S. Yan, "Sparse representation for computer vision and pattern recognition," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 98, no. 6, pp. 1031–1044, 2010.

[7] E. J. Candés and T. Tao, "The dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n," *Ann. Statist*, vol. 35, pp. 2313–2351, 2007.

[8] E. Amaldi and V. Kann, "On the approximability of minimizing nonzero variables or unsatisfied relations in linear systems," *Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 209, no. 1, pp. 237–260, 1998.

[9] D. L. Donoho, "For most large underdetermined systems of linear equations the minimal l_1-norm solution is also the sparsest solution," *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 797–829, 2006.

[10] J. J. Fuchs., "Recovery of exact sparse representations in the presence of bounded noise," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 3601–3608, 2005.

[11] D. L. Donoho, M. Elad, and V. N. Temlyakov, "Stable recovery of sparse overcomplete representations in the presence of noise," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 6–18, 2006.

[12] E. J. Candés, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, vol. 346, no. 11, pp. 589–592, 2008.

[13] J. Wen, D. Li, and F. Zhu, "Stable recovery of sparse signals via l_p-minimization," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 161–176, 2015.

[14] T. Cai and L. Wang, "Orthogonal matching pursuit for sparse signal recovery with noise," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 4680–4688, 2011.

[15] D. L. Donoho and X. Huo, "Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 2845–2862, 2001.

[16] S. Foucart and M.-J. Lai, "Sparsest solutions of underdetermined linear systems via l_q- minimization for $0 < q \leq 1$," *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 395–407, 2009.

[17] S. Foucart, "A note on guaranteed sparse recovery via l_1- minimization," *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, vol. 29, pp. 97–103, 2010.

[18] T. Cai and A. Zhang, "Sparse representation of a polytope and recovery of sparse signals and low-rank matrices," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 122–132, 2013.

[19] M. E. Davies and R. Gribonval, "Restricted isometry constants where l^p sparse recovery can fail for $0 < p \leq 1$," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2203–2214, 2009.

[20] J. A. Tropp and A. C. Gilbert, "Signal recovery from random measurements via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 4655–4666, 2007.

[21] M. Davenport and M. Wakin, "Analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit using the restricted isometry property," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4395–4401, 2010.

[22] E. Liu and V. Temlyakov, "The orthogonal super greedy algorithm and applications in compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp. 2040–2047, 2012.

[23] Q. Mo and S. Yi, "A remark on the restricted isometry property in orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3654–3656, 2012.

[24] J. Wang and B. Shim, "On the recovery limit of sparse signals using orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 4973–4976, 2012.

[25] L.-H. Chang and J.-Y. Wu, "An improved RIP-based performance guarantee for sparse signal recovery via orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 707–710, 2014.

[26] Q. Mo, "A sharp restricted isometry constant bound of orthogonal matching pursuit," *arXiv:1501.01708*, 2015.

[27] J. Wen, X. Zhu, and D. Li, "Improved bounds on the restricted isometry constant for orthogonal matching pursuit," *Electron. Lett.*, vol. 49, pp. 1487–1489, 2013.

[28] S. Mallat, *A wavelet tour of signal processing*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam, Academic press, 2008.

[29] E. Vincent, N. Bertin, R. Gribonval, and F. Bimbot, "From blind to guided audio source separation: How models and side information can improve the separation of sound," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 107–115, 2014.

[30] J. Ding, L. Chen, and Y. Gu, "Perturbation analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 398–410, 2013.

[31] C. Herzet, A. Drémeau, and C. Soussen, "Relaxed recovery conditions for OMP/OLS by exploiting both coherence and decay," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 459–470, 2016.

[32] Y. C. Eldar, P. Kuppinger, and H. Bölcskei, "Block-sparse signals: Uncertainty relations and efficient recovery," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3042–3054, 2010.

[33] G. Swirszcz, N. Abe, and A. C. Lozano, "Grouped orthogonal matching pursuit for variable selection and prediction," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2009, pp. 1150–1158.

[34] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies, "Sampling theorems for signals from the union of finite-dimensional linear subspaces," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 1872–1882, 2009.

[35] Y. C. Eldar and M. Mishali, "Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 11, pp. 5302–5316, 2009.

[36] Y. C. Eldar, "Compressed sensing of analog signals in shift-invariant spaces," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 2986–2997, 2009.

[37] K. Gedalyahu and Y. C. Eldar, "Time-delay estimation from low-rate samples: A union of subspaces approach," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3017–3031, 2010.

[38] M. Mishali and Y. C. Eldar, "Blind multiband signal reconstruction: Compressed sensing for analog signals," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 993–1009, 2009.

[39] ——, "From theory to practice: Sub-nyquist sampling of sparse wideband analog signals," *IEEE J. Sel. Topics Signal Process.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 375–391, 2010.

[40] J. Wright, A. Y. Yang, A. Ganesh, S. S. Sastry, and Y. Ma, "Robust face recognition via sparse representation," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 210–227, 2009.

[41] S. F. Cotter, B. D. Rao, K. Engan, and K. Kreutz-Delgado, "Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 2477–2488, 2005.

[42] J. Chen and X. Huo, "Theoretical results on sparse representations of multiple-measurement vectors," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 54, no. 12, pp. 4634–4643, 2006.

[43] E. Van Den Berg and M. P. Friedlander, "Theoretical and empirical results for recovery from multiple measurements," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 2516–2527, 2010.

[44] M.-J. Lai and Y. Liu, "The null space property for sparse recovery from multiple measurement vectors," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 402–406, 2011.

[45] E. Elhamifar and R. Vidal, "Sparse subspace clustering: Algorithm, theory, and applications," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 35, no. 11, pp. 2765–2781, 2013.

[46] E. J. Candés, J. Romberg, and T. Tao, "Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements," *Comm. Pure Appl. Math*, vol. 59, pp. 1207–1223, 2006.

[47] J. Wen, Z. Zhou, Z. Liu, M.-j. Lai, X. Tang, and J. Chen, "A sharp sufficient condition for stable recovery of block sparse signals by block orthogonal matching pursuit," *submitted to NIPS 2016*.

[48] W. Dai and O. Milenkovic, "Subspace pursuit for compressive sensing signal reconstruction," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 2230–2249, 2009.

[49] D. Needel and J. A. Tropp, "CoSaMP: Iterative signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate samples," *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 301–321, 2009.

[50] Y. Shen, B. Li, W. Pan, and J. Li, "Analysis of generalized orthogonal matching pursuit using restricted isometry constant," *Electron. Lett.*, vol. 50, no. 14, pp. 1020–1022, 2014.

[51] J. Wen, Z. Zhou, J. Wang, X. Tang, and Q. Mo, "A sharp condition for exact support recovery of sparse signals with orthogonal matching pursuit," *arXiv:1512.07248*.

[52] T. Zhang, "Sparse recovery with orthogonal matching pursuit in compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 6215–6221, 2011.

[53] E. D. Livshits, "On the efficiency of the orthogonal matching pursuit in compressive sensing," *Sbornik: Mathematics*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 183–195, 2012.

[54] E. D. Livshitz and V. N. Temlyakov, "Sparse approximation and recovery by greedy algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 60, no. 7, pp. 3989–4000, 2014.